arXiv:1304.6308v2 [math.DG] 24 Apr 2013

# CONVEX BODIES WITH PINCHED MAHLER VOLUME UNDER THE CENTRO-AFFINE NORMAL FLOWS

MOHAMMAD N. IVAKI

Abstract. We study the long time behavior of smooth, centrally symmetric convex bodies under the centro-affine normal flows. By means of a stability version of the Blaschke-Santaló inequality, we obtain regularity of centrally symmetric solutions to the centro-affine normal flows starting the flow from convex bodies with *pinched* Mahler volume. We prove that properly rescaled solutions converge sequentially to the unit ball in the $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ topology, modulo the group of special linear transformations.

## 1. Introduction

The setting of this paper is the $(n+1)$-dimensional Euclidean space, $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. A compact convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ with non-empty interior is called a *convex body.* For a given convex body $K$, the volume of $K$, denoted by $V(K)$, is its Lebesgue measure as a subset of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. We denote the set of compact, origin-symmetric, strictly convex bodies, which are smoothly embedded in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ by $\mathcal{K}_{sym}$.

Let $K \in \mathcal{K}_{sym}$ and $x_K : \mathbb{S}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be the Gauss parametrization of $\partial K$, the boundary of $K$. Therefore, $x_K(z)$ maps $z \in \mathbb{S}^n$ into the point on the $\partial K$ of the outer normal $z$. The support function of $\partial K$ is defined as $s_K(z) := \langle x_K(z), z\rangle$, for each $z \in \mathbb{S}^n$. The support function at $z$ is the distance of the supporting hyperplane at $x_K(z)$ from the origin. We denote the matrix of the radii of curvature of $\partial K$ by $\mathfrak{r} = [\mathfrak{r}_{ij}]_{1\leq i,j\leq n}$; the entries of $\mathfrak{r}$ are considered as functions on the unit sphere. They can be expressed in terms of the support function and its covariant derivatives as $\mathfrak{r}_{ij} := \bar{\nabla}_i\bar{\nabla}_j s + s\bar{g}_{ij}$, where $\bar{g}_{ij}$ is the standard metric on $\mathbb{S}^n$ and $\bar{\nabla}$ is the standard Levi-Civita connection of $\mathbb{S}^n$. The Gauss curvature of $\partial K$ is denoted by $\mathcal{K}$, and as a function on the unit sphere, it is also related to the support function of the convex body by

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{K}} := S_n = \det_{\bar{g}}(\bar{\nabla}_i\bar{\nabla}_j s + \bar{g}_{ij}s) := \frac{\det \mathfrak{r}_{ij}}{\det \bar{g}_{ij}}.$$

---

*Date*: April 25, 2013.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 53C44, 52A05; Secondary 35K55.

*Key words and phrases.* Geometric flows, Centro-affine normal flow, Centro-affine curvature, Blaschke-Santaló inequality, $p$-affine isoperimetric inequality.

Finally, the eigenvalues of $[\mathfrak{r}_{ij}]_{1\leq i,j\leq n}$ with respect to the metric $\bar{g}_{ij}$ are denoted by $\lambda_1\leq\lambda_2\leq\cdots\leq\lambda_n$ for $1\leq i\leq n$. Then the principal curvatures of $\partial K$ are $\kappa_i=\frac{1}{\lambda_i}$ for $1\leq i\leq n$.

We now proceed to describe the flow that we will study in this paper. Assume $p\geq 1$ is a fixed real number and let $K_0\in\mathcal{K}_{sym}$. We consider a family of convex bodies $\{K_t\}_t\in\mathcal{K}_{sym}$, and their associated smooth embeddings $x:\mathbb{S}^n\times[0,T)\to\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, which are evolving according to the $p$ centro-affine normal flow (in short $p$-flow), namely,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}x:=-s\left(\frac{\mathcal{K}}{s^{n+2}}\right)^{\frac{p}{n+1+p}}z,\;\; x(\cdot,0)=x_{K_0}(\cdot),\;\; x(\cdot,t)=x_{K_t}(\cdot). \tag{1.1}$$

As the name centro-affine suggests, solutions to the $p$-flow are $SL(n+1)$ invariant while Euclidean translations of an initial convex body will lead to different solutions, since translations affect the support function of the convex body which appears in the speed of the centro-affine normal flow. It is clear from the definition of the support function that, as the convex bodies $\{K_t\}_t$ evolve by (1.1), their corresponding support functions satisfy the following fully nonlinear second order partial differential equation:

$$\partial_t s(\cdot,t)=-s\left(\frac{\mathcal{K}}{s^{n+2}}\right)^{\frac{p}{n+1+p}}(\cdot,t),\;\; s(\cdot,0)=s_{K_0}(\cdot),\;\; s(\cdot,t)=s_{K_t}(\cdot) \tag{1.2}$$

The flow was recently defined by Stancu in [24] for the purpose of finding new global centro-affine invariants of smooth convex bodies in which a certain class of existing invariants arose naturally. Only the short time existence to the flow was then needed. Moreover, several interesting affine isoperimetric type inequalities were obtained via short time existence of the flow, [24]. One also may consult [24] to see an equivalent definition of the $p$-flow in terms of $SL(n+1)$ invariant quantities, e.q., in terms of a power of the centro-affine curvature, denoted by $\mathcal{K}/s^{n+2}$, in direction of the centro-affine normal vector.

The long time behavior of the $p$-flow in $\mathbb{R}^2$ was studied by the author in [13] using tools of affine differential geometry. It was proved there that the volume preserving $p$-flow with $p\geq 1$ evolves any convex body in $\mathcal{K}_{sym}$ to the unit disk in the Hausdorff distance, modulo $SL(2)$. Later as an application of the method developed in [13], a stability version of the $p$ affine isoperimetric inequality was established for $p\geq 1$ in the case of planar origin-symmetric smooth convex sets [14]. The $p$-flow for $p=1$ is the well-known affine normal flow, which has been investigated by Sapiro and Tannebaum [20] for convex planar curves, by Angenent, Sapiro and Tannebaum [8] for non-convex curves, and by Andrews [2, 4] in all dimensions. Andrews comprehensively studied the affine normal flow of compact, convex hypersurfaces in any dimension and showed that the volume preserving flow evolves any convex initial bounded open set exponentially fast, in the $C^\infty$ topology, to an ellipsoid. Moreover, ancient solutions, existence and regularity of solutions on non-compact strictly convex hypersurfaces for the affine normal flow have been obtained in [18] by Loftin and Tsui. In [16], the author jointly with Stancu studied the asymptotic behavior of (1.2) for $1 \leq p < \frac{n+1}{n-1}$. A curial ingredient there was the evolution equation of the dual convex bodies. Let $K^\circ$ denote the dual body associated to $K$ with respect to the origin, defined by

$$K^\circ = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \mid x \cdot y \leq 1,\ \forall x \in K\}.$$

It was proved in [24] that, if $\{K_t\}_{[0,T)}$ evolves by the $p$ centro-affine normal flow, then $\{K_t^\circ\}_{[0,T)}$ is a solution of the following evolution equation, the expanding $p$-flow (alternatively called the dual $p$-flow):

$$\partial_t s^\circ = s^\circ \left(\frac{\mathcal{K}^\circ}{s^{\circ n+2}}\right)^{-\frac{p}{n+1+p}}.$$

This important observation was the key to obtain the regularity estimates in [16]. It was proved that

**Theorem 1.1.** [16] *Let $1 \leq p < \frac{n+1}{n-1}$ be a real number. Let $x_{K_0} : \mathbb{S}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be a smooth, strictly convex embedding of $K_0 \in \mathcal{K}_{sym}$. Then there exists a unique solution $x : \mathbb{S}^n \times [0,T) \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ of equation (1.1) with initial data $x_{K_0}$. The rescaled convex bodies given by the embeddings $\left(\frac{V(B^{n+1})}{V(K_t)}\right)^{\frac{1}{n+1}} x_{K_t}$ converge sequentially in the $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ topology to the unit ball, modulo $SL(n+1)$.*

In this paper, taking a different standard rescaling and for every $n \geq 2$, it is proved that:

**Theorem 1.2** (Main Theorem)**.** *Let $p \geq \frac{n+1}{n-1}$ be a real number and let $x_{K_0} : \mathbb{S}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be a smooth, strictly convex embedding of $K_0 \in \mathcal{K}_{sym}$. Then there exists a unique solution $x : \mathbb{S}^n \times [0,T) \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ of equation (1.1) with initial data $x_{K_0}$. Furthermore, there exist an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that if $V(K_0)V(K_0^\circ) > \frac{\omega_{n+1}^2}{1+\varepsilon}$, then the rescaled convex bodies given by the embeddings $\frac{1}{\left(\frac{2p(n+1)}{p+n+1}(T-t)\right)^{\frac{p+n+1}{2p(n+1)}}} x_{K_t}$ converge sequentially in the $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ topology to the unit ball, modulo $SL(n+1)$.*

The short time existence and uniqueness of solutions for a smooth and strictly convex initial hypersurface follow from the strict parabolicity of the equation and it was shown in [24]. The restriction to origin-symmetric domains, is natural in the centro-affine context. Furthermore, the technical difficulty in studying the $p$ centro-affine normal flows when $p > \frac{n+1}{n-1}$ is caused by the fact that for this range of $p$, $\mathcal{K}^p$, has homogeneity degree greater than one. The asymptotic behavior of convex hypersurfaces under geometric flows by speeds which are homogeneous functions of the principal curvatures of degree $\alpha > 1$ has been a central focus of many papers.

These papers are mainly divided into two categories, depending whether a pinching ratio on principal curvatures is assumed or not. In the former direction, one would like to show that solutions become spherical as they contract to points if a suitable pinching conditions on the curvature of the initial hypersurface is imposed. A pioneering work is [12] where Chow treated powers of the Gauss curvature. Other examples of such results are: powers of the mean curvature by Schulze [22], powers of the scalar curvature by Alessandroni and Sinestrari [1], powers of the $m$-th mean curvature by Cabezas-Rivas and Sinestrari [11] and a generalization of their result by Wu, Tian and Li [26], and recently flows by general functions of the principal curvatures by Andrews and McCoy [7]. In this category, the pinching ratio on the initial hypersurface is assumed to ensure that we do not lose any regularity during the existence of the flow. In the latter category, the goal is to show without a pinching ratio on principal curvatures, solutions become spherical as they contract to points. The first such results was obtained by Andrews [3], in connection to Firey's conjecture. Other example of such results are: powers of the Gauss curvature by Andrews and Chen [6], second power of the norm of the second fundamental by Schnürer [21], and several more examples by Schulze and Schnürer [22]. These last mentioned results, in the second category, are all restricted to dimension three.

In this paper, using a stability version of the Blaschke-Santaló inequality (alternatively, stability of the $p$-affine isoperimetric inequality), we take a different approach. We do not impose any pinching condition on the principal curvatures of the initial convex body. We only assume that the initial smooth, origin-symmetric convex body has $\varepsilon$-*pinched* Mahler volume for small enough $\varepsilon > 0$ to be determined later.

The Mahler volume of a origin-symmetric convex body $K$ is defined as $V(K)V(K^{\circ})$, which is an invariant quantity under the group $GL(n+1)$. The Blaschke-Santaló inequality states that the Mahler volume is maximized only for ellipsoids centered at the origin. That is

$$V(K)V(K^{\circ}) \leq \omega_{n+1}^{2}$$

with equality only for origin centered ellipsoids, [10]. If a convex body $K$ satisfies $V(K)V(K^{\circ}) > \frac{\omega_{n+1}^{2}}{1+\varepsilon}$, we say its Mahler volume, $V(K)V(K^{\circ})$, is $\varepsilon$-*pinched*. Notice that continuity of the Mahler volume in the Hausdorff distance shows that a smooth convex body can have arbitrarily large ratio $\lambda_n/\lambda_1$ while whose Mahler volume is close to the maximum value. This can be seen by cutting off negligible volumes from opposite caps of a ball and smoothing out the spherical edges. From this point of view, in this paper a weaker pinching condition is imposed compared to the conventional pinching condition on the principal curvatures. Finally, we would like to point out that, as it will be shown in Corollary 3.5, preservation of the pinching along the $p$-flow is an immediate corollary of the monotonicity of the Mahler volume under the $p$-flow.

## 2. Convergence of volume to zero

Given a convex body $K$, the inner radius of $K$, $r_-(K)$, is the radius of the largest ball inscribed in $K$; the circumradius of $K$, $r_+(K)$, is the radius of the smallest ball containing $K$. Notice that for any origin-symmetric convex body, the smallest and largest ball as above will be centered at the origin.

**Lemma 2.1.** *The flow (1.2) increases in time*

$$\min_{\mathbb{S}^n}\left(s\left(\frac{\mathcal{K}}{s^{n+2}}\right)^{\frac{p}{p+n+1}}\right)(z,t).$$

*Proof.* We compute the evolution equation of the speed. Let $\alpha := 1-\frac{(n+2)p}{p+n+1}$ and $\beta := -\frac{p}{p+n+1}$.

$$\partial_t\left(s^{\alpha}S_n^{\beta}\right) = -\beta s^{\alpha}S_n^{\beta-1}(\dot{S}_n)^{ij}[\bar{\nabla}_i\bar{\nabla}_j\left(s^{\alpha}S_n^{\beta}\right)+\bar{g}_{ij}\left(s^{\alpha}S_n^{\beta}\right)]-\alpha s^{2\alpha-1}S_{2\beta},$$

where $(\dot{S}_n)^{ij} := \dfrac{\partial S_n}{\partial \mathfrak{r}_{ij}}$ is the derivative of the $S_n$ with respect to the entry $\mathfrak{r}_{ij}$ of the radii of curvature matrix. Since $\beta$ and $\alpha$ are both nonpositive, the claim follows from the maximum principle. □

**Lemma 2.2.** *For each smooth, strictly convex solution $\{K_t\}_{[0,t_1]}$ of the evolution equation (1.2) with $0 < R_- \leq r_-(K_t) \leq r_+(K_t) \leq R_+ < +\infty$ for $t \in [0,t_1]$, and some positive numbers $R_-$ and $R_+$, we have*

$$\mathcal{K}(z,t) \leq C_1(n,R_-)+C_2(R_+,R_-)\max_{z\in\mathbb{S}^n}\mathcal{K}(z,0)$$

*where $C_1$ and $C_2$ are constants depending on $n, R_-$ and $R_+$.*

*Proof.* We apply a standard technique of Tso [25]. For simplicity, we may set $\alpha := 1-\frac{(n+2)p}{p+n+1}$ and $\beta := -\frac{p}{p+n+1}$. Employing the maximum principle, we will prove that $\Psi(z,t)$ defined by

$$\Psi = \frac{s^{\alpha}S_n^{\beta}}{s-R_-/2}$$

is a bounded function from above with a bound only depending on $n, p, R_-, R_+$, and $\max_{\mathbb{S}^n}\Psi(z,0)$. At the point where the maximum of $\Psi$ realized, we get

$$0=\bar{\nabla}_i\Psi=\bar{\nabla}_i\left(\frac{s^{\alpha}S_n^{\beta}}{s-R_-/2}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\nabla}_i\bar{\nabla}_j\Psi \leq 0.$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\frac{\bar{\nabla}_i(s^{\alpha}S_n^{\beta})}{s-R_-/2}=\frac{(s^{\alpha}S_n^{\beta})\bar{\nabla}_i s}{(s-R_-/2)^2},$$

and consequently,

$$\bar{\nabla}_i\bar{\nabla}_j\left(s^{\alpha}S_n^{\beta}\right)+\bar{g}_{ij}\left(s^{\alpha}S_n^{\beta}\right)\leq\frac{s^{\alpha}S_n^{\beta}\mathfrak{r}_{ij}-R_-/2s^{\alpha}S_n^{\beta}\bar{g}_{ij}}{s-R_-/2}. \tag{2.1}$$

To apply the parabolic maximum principle, we calculate the time derivative of $\Psi$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t\Psi=&-\frac{\beta s^{\alpha}S_n^{\beta-1}}{s-R_-/2}(\dot{S}_n)^{ij}\left[\bar{\nabla}_i\bar{\nabla}_j\left(s^{\alpha}S_n^{\beta}\right)+\bar{g}_{ij}\left(s^{\alpha}S_n^{\beta}\right)\right]\\&+\frac{S_n^{\beta}}{s-R_-/2}\partial_t s^{\alpha}+\frac{s^{2\alpha}S_n^{2\beta}}{(s-R_-/2)^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Also notice that

$$\frac{S_n^{\beta}}{s-R_-/2}\partial_t s^{\alpha}=-\alpha\Psi^2+\frac{\alpha R_-}{2}\frac{s^{2\alpha-1}S_n^{2\beta}}{(s-R_-/2)^2}\leq-\alpha\Psi^2. \tag{2.2}$$

Hence, using inequalities (2.1) and (2.2) we infer that, at the point where the maximum of $\Psi$ is reached, we have

$$\partial_t\Psi\leq\Psi^2\left(-n\beta-\alpha+1+\frac{\beta R_-}{2}\mathcal{H}\right), \tag{2.3}$$

where the symbol $\mathcal{H}$ stands for the mean curvature. We consider two cases. First, we may assume that the maximum of $\Psi$ is achieved at a time $t>0$. In this case, we have $\partial_t\Psi\geq 0$. So inequality (2.3) implies that

$$\mathcal{K}(z,t)\leq\left(\frac{\mathcal{H}}{n}\right)^n\leq\left(\frac{4(n+1)}{nR_-}\right)^n=:C_1(n,R_-).$$

Second, the maximum of $\Psi$ may occur at $t=0$, we then have

$$\frac{s\left(\frac{\mathcal{K}}{s^{n+2}}\right)^{\frac{p}{p+n+1}}}{s-R_-/2}(z,t)\leq\frac{s\left(\frac{\mathcal{K}}{s^{n+2}}\right)^{\frac{p}{p+n+1}}}{s-R_-/2}(z,0)\leq C(R_+,R_-)\mathcal{K}(z,0)$$

and thus

$$\mathcal{K}(z,t)\leq C_2(R_+,R_-)\mathcal{K}(z,0).$$

□

*Remark* 2.3. Notice that if the Gauss curvature is bounded from above, then a lower bound on the principal curvatures implies an upper bound on the principal curvatures.

Regarding a lower on the principal curvatures, we recall the following lemma from [16]:

**Lemma 2.4** (Lower bound on the principal curvatures)**.** [16] *Let* $\{K_t\}_{[0,t_1]}$ *be a smooth strictly convex solution of equation (1.2) with* $0<R_-\leq r_-(K_t)\leq r_+(K_t)\leq R_+<+\infty$ *and suppose that*

$$C_1\leq S_n\leq C_2$$

*for all* $t \in [0, t_1]$. *Then there exist constants* $C$ *and* $C'$ *depending on* $n, p, R_-$, $R_+, C_1$ *and* $C_2$ *such that*

$$\kappa_i \geq \frac{1}{C + C' t^{-(n-1)}},$$

*for all* $t \in [0, t_1]$.

**Theorem 2.5.** *Let* $x_{K_0} : \mathbb{S}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ *be a smooth, strictly convex embedding of* $K_0 \in \mathcal{K}_{sym}$. *Then there exists a unique solution* $x : \mathbb{S}^n \times [0, T) \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ *of equation (1.1) with initial data* $x_{K_0}$, *for a maximal finite* $T$, *such that* $\lim_{t \to T} V(K_t) = 0$.

*Proof.* Let $B_0$ be a large ball such that whose boundary at time zero encloses $K_0$. It can be easily verified that the solution to the $p$-flow starting from $B_0$, denoted by $B_t$, shrinks to the origin in finite time. By the containment principle, $K_t \subseteq B_t$, therefore $T$ must be finite. Now suppose that, contrary to our claim, $V(K_t)$ does not tend to zero. Thus, we must have $s(\cdot, t) \geq R_-$ on $[0, T)$, for some $R_- > 0$. By Lemmas 2.1, 2.2, 2.4 and Remark 2.3 the principal curvatures of the solution remain uniformly bounded on $[0, T)$ from below and above. Consequently, the evolution equation (1.2) is uniformly parabolic on $[0, T)$, and bounds on higher derivatives of the support function follows by [17] and Schauder theory. Hence, we can extend the solution beyond $T$, contradicting maximality of $T$. □

## 3. Bounding the isoperimetric ratio

It is known that the shapes with the largest possible Mahler volume are the spheres and ellipsoids; this is known as the Blaschke-Santaló inequality. We state a stability version of the Blaschke-Santaló inequality which has been proved by K. Ball and K.J. Böröczky in [9] for $n > 1$. We only present their result in the class of origin-symmetric convex bodies. To do so, we need a preparatory definition.

**Definition 3.1.** The Banach-Mazur distance of two origin-symmetric convex bodies $K$ and $L$ is defined by

$$\delta_{BM}(K, L) = \ln \min\{\lambda \geq 1 : L \subseteq A(K) \subseteq \lambda L \quad \text{for} \quad A \in GL(n+1)\}$$

We denote the volume of the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ by $\omega_{n+1} = V(B^{n+1})$.

**Theorem 3.2** (Stability of the Blaschke-Santaló inequality)**.** [9] *If* $K \in \mathcal{K}_{sym}$ *is a convex body in* $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, $n \geq 2$, *and*

$$V(K)V(K^\circ) > \frac{\omega_{n+1}^2}{1 + \varepsilon}$$

*for an* $\varepsilon > 0$, *then for some* $\gamma$ *depending only on* $n$, *we have*

$$\delta_{BM}(K, B^{n+1}) \leq \gamma \varepsilon^{\frac{2}{3(n+2)}} |\log \varepsilon|^{\frac{4}{3(n+2)}}.$$

The following result is proved by Stancu in [24].

**Theorem 3.3** (Monotonicity of the Mahler volume)**.** [24] *Let* $\{K_t\}_{[0,T)}$ *be a smooth, strictly convex solution of equation* (1.2)*. Then the Mahler volume,* $V(K_t)V(K_t^\circ)$*, is non-decreasing along the p-flow. The monotonicity is strict unless* $K_t$ *is an ellipsoid centered at the origin.*

Combining these last two theorems we obtain:

**Corollary 3.4.** *Let* $\{K_t\}_{[0,T)}$ *be a smooth, strictly convex solution of equation* (1.2)*. If*

$$V(K_0)V(K_0^\circ) > \frac{\omega_{n+1}^2}{1+\varepsilon}$$

*for an* $\varepsilon > 0$*, then we have*

$$\delta_{BM}(K_t, B^{n+1}) \leq \gamma\varepsilon^{\frac{2}{3(n+2)}}|\log\varepsilon|^{\frac{4}{3(n+2)}}.$$

Now from the definition of the Banach-Mazur distance we have:

**Corollary 3.5.** *Let* $\{K_t\}_{[0,T)}$ *be a smooth, strictly convex solution of equation* (1.2)*. If*

$$V(K_0)V(K_0^\circ) > \frac{\omega_{n+1}^2}{1+\varepsilon}$$

*for an* $\varepsilon > 0$*, then for each time* $t$ *there exists a special centro-affine transformation* $A_t \in SL(n+1)$*, such that*

$$\frac{r_+(A_t(K_t))}{r_-(A_t(K_t))} \leq \exp\left(\gamma\varepsilon^{\frac{2}{3(n+2)}}|\log\varepsilon|^{\frac{4}{3(n+2)}}\right) := \delta.$$

In the remainder of this paper, we take an $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough such that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(1-\left[\delta^{1+\alpha}-0.5\right]^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}\right)\\ &=\left(1-\left[\exp\left((1+\alpha)\gamma\varepsilon^{\frac{2}{3(n+2)}}|\log\varepsilon|^{\frac{4}{3(n+2)}}\right)-0.5\right]^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}\right)>0. \qquad (3.1)\end{aligned}$$

Notice that this assumption in particular implies that $1 \leq \delta < 1.5^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}$. We now restate our main theorem:

**Theorem 3.6** (Main Theorem)**.** *Let* $p \geq \frac{n+1}{n-1}$ *be a real number and let* $x_{K_0} : \mathbb{S}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ *be a smooth, strictly convex embedding of* $K_0 \in \mathcal{K}_{sym}$*. Then there exists a unique solution* $x : \mathbb{S}^n \times [0,T) \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ *of equation* (1.1) *with initial data* $x_{K_0}$*. Furthermore, if for an* $\varepsilon > 0$ *satisfying the assumption* (3.1)*, the Mahler volume of* $K_0$ *is* $\varepsilon$*-pinched, then the rescaled convex bodies given by the embeddings* $\frac{1}{\left(\frac{2p(n+1)}{p+n+1}(T-t)\right)^{\frac{p+n+1}{2p(n+1)}}}x_{K_t}$ *converge sequentially in the* $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ *topology to the unit ball, modulo* $SL(n+1)$*.*

## 4. Upper and lower bounds on the centro-affine curvature

In this section, we obtain upper and lower bounds on the centro-affine curvature along the $p$-flow. We begin by an upper bound on the Gauss curvature.

**Lemma 4.1** (Upper bound on the Gauss curvature)**.** [16] *For any smooth, strictly convex solution* $\{K_t\}_{[0,t_1]}$ *of the evolution equation (1.2) with* $0 < R_- \leq r_-(K_t) \leq r_+(K_t) \leq R_+ < +\infty$ *for* $t \in [0, t_1]$*, and some positive numbers* $R_\pm$*, we have*

$$\mathcal{K}^{\frac{p}{n+p+1}} \leq \left(C + C' t^{-\frac{np}{(n+1)(p+1)}}\right),$$

*where* $C$ *and* $C'$ *are constants depending on* $n, p, R_-$ *and* $R_+$*.*

To obtain a lower bound on the centro-affine curvature, we begin by proving the following Harnack estimate. In dimension two, the Harnack estimate for the $p$-flow is verified in [15].

**Lemma 4.2** (Harnack estimate)**.** *Let* $\{K_t\}_t$ *be a smooth solution of the evolution equation (1.2). Then*

$$\partial_t \left( s \left( \frac{\mathcal{K}}{s^{n+2}} \right)^{\frac{p}{p+n+1}} t^{\frac{np}{(p+1)(n+1)}} \right) \geq 0,$$

*or equivalently*

$$\partial_t \left( s \left( \frac{\mathcal{K}}{s^{n+2}} \right)^{\frac{p}{p+n+1}} \right) \geq -\frac{np}{(p+1)(n+1)t} \left( s \left( \frac{\mathcal{K}}{s^{n+2}} \right)^{\frac{p}{p+n+1}} \right).$$

*Proof.* For simplicity, we set $\gamma = -\frac{p}{p+n+1}$. To prove the lemma, using the parabolic maximum principle, we prove that the quantity defined by

$$\mathcal{R} := -t\partial_t \left( s^{1+(n+2)\gamma} S_n^{\gamma} \right) - \frac{\gamma}{\gamma - 1/n} s^{1+(n+2)\gamma} S_n^{\gamma} \tag{4.1}$$

is negative as long as the $p$-flow exists. Define $\mathcal{P} := -\partial_t \left( s^{1+(n+2)\gamma} S_n^{\gamma} \right)$. Using the evolution equation of $s$ and $\mathfrak{r}_{ij}$, we have the following expression for $\mathcal{P}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P} &= (1 + (n+2)\gamma) s^{1+2(n+2)\gamma} S_n^{2\gamma} \\ &\quad + \gamma s^{1+(n+2)\gamma} S_n^{\gamma-1} (\dot{S}_n)^{ij} \left[ \bar{\nabla}_i \bar{\nabla}_j \left( s^{1+(n+2)\gamma} S_n^{\gamma} \right) + \bar{g}_{ij} s^{1+(n+2)\gamma} S_n^{\gamma} \right] \\ &:= (1 + (n+2)\gamma) s^{1+2(n+2)\gamma} S_n^{2\gamma} + \gamma s^{1+(n+2)\gamma} S_n^{\gamma-1} \mathcal{Q}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

To calculate the evolution equation of $\mathcal{P}$, we will use repeatedly the evolution equations of $s$ and $\mathfrak{r}_{ij}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t\mathcal{P}\\
&= -(1+(n+2)\gamma)(1+2(n+2)\gamma)s^{1+3(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{3\gamma}\\
&- 2\gamma(1+(n+2)\gamma)s^{1+2(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{2\gamma-1}(\dot{S}_n)^{ij}\left[\bar\nabla_i\bar\nabla_j\left(s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma}\right)+\bar g_{ij}s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma}\right]\\
&- \gamma(1+(n+2)\gamma)s^{1+2(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{2\gamma-1}(\dot{S}_n)^{ij}\left[\bar\nabla_i\bar\nabla_j\left(s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma}\right)+\bar g_{ij}s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma}\right]\\
&- \gamma(\gamma-1)s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma-2}\left((\dot{S}_n)^{ij}\left[\bar\nabla_i\bar\nabla_j\left(s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma}\right)+\bar g_{ij}s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma}\right]\right)^2\\
&- \gamma s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma-1}(\ddot{S}_n)^{ij,kl}\left[\bar\nabla_i\bar\nabla_j\mathcal{P}+\bar g_{ij}\mathcal{P}\right]\left[\bar\nabla_k\bar\nabla_l\mathcal{P}+\bar g_{kl}\mathcal{P}\right]\\
&- \gamma s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma-1}(\dot{S}_n)^{ij}\left[\bar\nabla_i\bar\nabla_j\mathcal{P}+\bar g_{ij}\mathcal{P}\right]\\
&\le -(1+(n+2)\gamma)(1+2(n+2)\gamma)s^{1+3(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{3\gamma}\\
&- 3\gamma(1+(n+2)\gamma)s^{1+2(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{2\gamma-1}\mathcal{Q}-\gamma(\gamma-1)s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma-2}\mathcal{Q}^2\\
&- \frac{n-1}{n}\gamma s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma-2}\mathcal{Q}^2-\gamma s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma-1}(\dot{S}_n)^{ij}\left[\bar\nabla_i\bar\nabla_j\mathcal{P}+\bar g_{ij}\mathcal{P}\right]\\
&= -(1+(n+2)\gamma)(1+2(n+2)\gamma)s^{1+3(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{3\gamma}\\
&- 3\gamma(1+(n+2)\gamma)s^{1+2(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{2\gamma-1}\mathcal{Q}-\gamma\left(\gamma-1+\frac{n-1}{n}\right)s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma-2}\mathcal{Q}^2\\
&- \gamma s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma-1}(\dot{S}_n)^{ij}\left[\bar\nabla_i\bar\nabla_j\mathcal{P}+\bar g_{ij}\mathcal{P}\right],
\end{aligned}
$$

where we used concavity of $S_n^{1/n}$:

$$\left((\ddot{S}_n)^{ij,kl}-\frac{n-1}{nS_n}(\dot{S}_n)^{ij}(\dot{S}_n)^{kl}\right)a_{ij}a_{lk}\le 0$$

for every symmetric matrix $[a_{ij}]_{1\le i,j\le n}$. By definition of $\mathcal{Q}$, (4.2):

$$\mathcal{Q}=\frac{\mathcal{P}-(1+(n+2)\gamma)s^{1+2(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{2\gamma}}{\gamma s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma-1}} \tag{4.3}$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Q}^2&=\left(\frac{\mathcal{P}-(1+(n+2)\gamma)s^{1+2(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{2\gamma}}{\gamma s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma-1}}\right)^2\\
&=\frac{\mathcal{P}^2}{\gamma^2 s^{2+2(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{2\gamma-2}}-\frac{2(1+(n+2)\gamma)}{\gamma^2}\frac{\mathcal{P}S_n^2}{s}\\
&+\frac{(1+(n+2)\gamma)^2}{\gamma^2}s^{2(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{2\gamma+2}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.4}
$$

We replace $\mathcal{Q}$ and $\mathcal{Q}^2$ in the evolution equation of $\mathcal{P}$ by their equivalent expressions from (4.3) and (4.4). So we find that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t \mathcal{P}\\
&\leq -(1+(n+2)\gamma)(1+2(n+2)\gamma)s^{1+3(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{3\gamma}\\
&-3\gamma(1+(n+2)\gamma)s^{1+2(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{2\gamma-1}\left(\frac{\mathcal{P}-(1+(n+2)\gamma)s^{1+2(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{2\gamma}}{\gamma s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma-1}}\right)\\
&-\gamma\left(\gamma-1+\frac{n-1}{n}\right)s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma-2}\left(\frac{\mathcal{P}^2}{\gamma^2 s^{2+2(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{2\gamma-2}}\right)\\
&+\gamma\left(\gamma-1+\frac{n-1}{n}\right)s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma-2}\left(\frac{2(1+(n+2)\gamma)}{\gamma^2}\frac{\mathcal{P}S_n^2}{s}\right)\\
&-\gamma\left(\gamma-1+\frac{n-1}{n}\right)s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma-2}\left(\frac{(1+(n+2)\gamma)^2}{\gamma^2}s^{2(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{2\gamma+2}\right)\\
&-\gamma s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma-1}(\dot{S}_n)^{ij}\left[\bar{\nabla}_i\bar{\nabla}_j\mathcal{P}+\bar{g}_{ij}\mathcal{P}\right]\\
&=-\gamma s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma-1}(\dot{S}_n)^{ij}\left[\bar{\nabla}_i\bar{\nabla}_j\mathcal{P}+\bar{g}_{ij}\mathcal{P}\right]\\
&+\left[(1+(n+2)\gamma)(2+(n+2)\gamma)-\frac{(\gamma-1/n)(1+(n+2)\gamma)^2}{\gamma}\right]s^{1+3(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{3\gamma}\\
&+\left[-3(1+(n+2)\gamma)+\frac{2(\gamma-1/n)(1+(n+2)\gamma)}{\gamma}\right]s^{(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma}\mathcal{P}\\
&-\frac{\gamma-1/n}{\gamma}\frac{\mathcal{P}^2}{s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma}}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.5}
$$

We now proceed to obtain the evolution equation of $\mathcal{R}=t\mathcal{P}-\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1/n}s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma}$ which was defined in (4.1). First notice that

$$
\begin{aligned}
-\gamma s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma-1}(\dot{S}_n)^{ij}\bar{\nabla}_i\bar{\nabla}_j\mathcal{R} &= -t\gamma s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma-1}(\dot{S}_n)^{ij}\bar{\nabla}_i\bar{\nabla}_j\mathcal{P}\\
&+\frac{\gamma^2}{\gamma-1/n}s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma-1}(\dot{S}_n)^{ij}\bar{\nabla}_i\bar{\nabla}_j(s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma}).
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.6}
$$

By identity (4.2), the evolution equation of $\mathcal{P}$ given by equation (4.5), and the identity (4.6), it is straightforward to calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t\mathcal{R}\\
&\leq -t\gamma s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma-1}(\dot{S}_n)^{ij}\left[\cancel{\bar{\nabla}_i\bar{\nabla}_j}\mathcal{P}+\bar{g}_{ij}\mathcal{P}\right]\\
&+t\left[(1+(n+2)\gamma)(2+(n+2)\gamma)-\frac{(\gamma-1/n)(1+(n+2)\gamma)^2}{\gamma}\right]s^{1+3(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{3\gamma}\\
&+t\left[-3(1+(n+2)\gamma)+\frac{2(\gamma-1/n)(1+(n+2)\gamma)}{\gamma}\right]s^{(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma}\mathcal{P}\\
&-t\frac{\gamma-1/n}{\gamma}\frac{\mathcal{P}^2}{s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma}}+\mathcal{P}+\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}\cancel{\mathcal{R}}-\gamma s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma-1}(\dot{S}_n)^{ij}\bar{\nabla}_i\bar{\nabla}_j\mathcal{R}\\
&+t\gamma s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma-1}(\dot{S}_n)^{ij}\cancel{\bar{\nabla}_i\bar{\nabla}_j}\mathcal{P}-\frac{\gamma^2}{\gamma-1/n}s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma-1}(\dot{S}_n)^{ij}\cancel{\bar{\nabla}_i\bar{\nabla}_j}(s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma})\\
&-\frac{\gamma^2}{\gamma-1/n}s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma-1}\cancel{(\dot{S}_n)^{ij}}(s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma})\bar{g}_{ij}\\
&+\frac{\gamma^2}{\gamma-1/n}s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma-1}(\dot{S}_n)^{ij}(s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma})\bar{g}_{ij}\\
&-\frac{\gamma(1+(n+2)\gamma)}{\gamma-1/n}s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}\cancel{S_n^{\gamma-1}}\left(s^{1+2(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{2\gamma}\right)\\
&+\frac{\gamma(1+(n+2)\gamma)}{\gamma-1/n}s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma-1}\left(s^{1+2(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{2\gamma}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t\mathcal{R}\\
&=-\gamma s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma-1}(\dot{S}_n)^{ij}\bar{\nabla}_i\bar{\nabla}_j\mathcal{R}\\
&+t\left[(1+(n+2)\gamma)(2+(n+2)\gamma)-\frac{(\gamma-1/n)(1+(n+2)\gamma)^2}{\gamma}\right]s^{1+3(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{3\gamma}\\
&+t\left[-3(1+(n+2)\gamma)+\frac{2(\gamma-1/n)(1+(n+2)\gamma)}{\gamma}\right]s^{(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma}\mathcal{P}\\
&-t\frac{\gamma-1/n}{\gamma}\frac{\mathcal{P}^2}{s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma}}+\mathcal{P}-t\gamma s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma-1}(\dot{S}_n)^{ij}\bar{g}_{ij}\mathcal{P}\\
&+\frac{\gamma^2}{\gamma-1/n}s^{2+2(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{2\gamma-1}(\dot{S}_n)^{ij}\bar{g}_{ij}+\frac{\gamma(1+(n+2)\gamma)}{\gamma-1/n}s^{2+3(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{3\gamma-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

To make this last computation useful, using the definition of $\mathcal{R}$, we replace $t\mathcal{P}$ by $\mathcal{R}+\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1/n}s^{1+(n+2)\gamma}S_n^{\gamma}$. Thus, at the point where the maximum of $\mathcal{R}$ is achieved we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t \mathcal{R} \leq \\
&\left[-3(1+(n+2)\gamma) + \frac{2(\gamma-1/n)(1+(n+2)\gamma)}{\gamma}\right] s^{(n+2)\gamma} S_n^{\gamma} \mathcal{R} \\
&+ \frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1/n}\left[-3(1+(n+2)\gamma) + \frac{2(\gamma-1/n)(1+(n+2)\gamma)}{\gamma}\right] s^{1+2(n+2)\gamma} S_n^{2\gamma} \\
&- \frac{\gamma-1/n}{\gamma}\frac{1}{s^{1+(n+2)\gamma} S_n^{\gamma}}\left(\mathcal{R} + \cancel{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1/n}} s^{1+(n+2)\gamma} S_n^{\gamma}\right)\mathcal{P} + \cancel{\mathcal{P}} \\
&- \gamma s^{1+(n+2)\gamma} S_n^{\gamma-1} (\dot{S}_n)^{ij} \bar{g}_{ij}\left(\mathcal{R} + \bcancel{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1/n}} s^{1+(n+2)\gamma} S_n^{\gamma}\right) \\
&+ \bcancel{\frac{\gamma^2}{\gamma-1/n}} s^{2+2(n+2)\gamma} S_n^{2\gamma-1} (\dot{S}_n)^{ij} \bar{g}_{ij} + \frac{\gamma(1+(n+2)\gamma)}{\gamma-1/n} s^{2+3(n+2)\gamma} S_n^{3\gamma-1} \\
&+ t\left[(1+(n+2)\gamma)(2+(n+2)\gamma) - \frac{(\gamma-1/n)(1+(n+2)\gamma)^2}{\gamma}\right] s^{1+3(n+2)\gamma} S_n^{3\gamma}.
\end{aligned}$$

There two groups of terms: those that have $\mathcal{R}$ and those that do not have $\mathcal{R}$. In the latter group, the terms on the second, fifth, and sixth line are all negative as $-1 < \gamma \leq -1/(n+2)$. In view of the parabolic maximum principle, the former group is well-behaved. Since at the time $t = 0$ we have $\mathcal{R} < 0$ manifestly, we conclude that it remains negative. The proof is now complete. □

Our proof of the following lemma is different from those in [7] and [23]. Since the $p$-flow in not invariant under Euclidean translations, we cannot apply the approach that is taken in [7], instead we will exploit the Harnack estimate that is proved in Lemma 4.2.

**Lemma 4.3.** *Fix $z \in \mathbb{S}^n$, then*

$$\left(1 - \frac{np}{(p+1)(n+1)}\right)\left(s_{K_t}(z,t) - s_{K_{t_0}}(z,t_0)\right) + (t-t_0)\left(s\left(\frac{\mathcal{K}}{s^{n+2}}\right)^{\frac{p}{p+n+1}}\right)(z,t)$$

*is nonnegative for all $t_0 \leq t < T$.*

*Proof.* Denote the left hand side of the claimed inequality by $Q(t)$. We will prove $\frac{d}{dt}Q(t) \geq 0$. We calculate the time derivative of $Q(t)$ :

$$\frac{d}{dt}Q(t) = \left(\frac{np}{(p+1)(n+1)}\right) s\left(\frac{\mathcal{K}}{s^{n+2}}\right)^{\frac{p}{p+n+1}} + (t-t_0)\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(s\left(\frac{\mathcal{K}}{s^{n+2}}\right)^{\frac{p}{p+n+1}}\right).$$

Notice that by Lemma 4.2, after a time shifting, we have

$$\partial_t\left(s\left(\frac{\mathcal{K}}{s^{n+2}}\right)^{\frac{p}{p+n+1}}\right) \geq -\frac{np}{(p+1)(n+1)(t-t_0)}\left(s\left(\frac{\mathcal{K}}{s^{n+2}}\right)^{\frac{p}{p+n+1}}\right)$$

for all $t > t_0$. The proof is complete; at the time $t = t_0$ we have $Q(t_0) = 0$. □

Having Lemma 4.3 in hand, we modify the argument of Andrews and McCoy presented in section 12 of [7] to obtain a lower bound on the centro-affine curvature under the $p$-flow.

In the remainder of the present text, we set $\alpha := -1 + \frac{2(n+1)p}{p+n+1}$; this is the homogeneity degree of the speed of the $p$-flow.

**Lemma 4.4** (Lower bound on the centro-affine curvature)**.** *Let $K_0$ be a convex body whose Mahler volume is $\varepsilon$-pinched and the assumption (3.1) is satisfied. Let $\{K_t\}_{[0,T)}$ be the smooth, strictly convex solution of the evolution equation (1.2). Then there exist a constant $C > 0$ and a time $t_* < T$, such that for each $t \geq t_*$ we have*

$$\left(\frac{\mathcal{K}}{s^{n+2}}\right)^{\frac{p}{p+n+1}}(z,t) \geq \frac{C}{T-t}.$$

*Proof.* By Corollary 3.5, for each $\tau \geq 0$ there exists a special centro-affine transformation, $A_\tau$, such that $\frac{r_+(A_\tau(K_\tau))}{r_-(A_\tau(K_\tau))} \leq \delta$. Fix a $\tau \geq 0$. Since $A_\tau(K_\tau)$ is origin-symmetric, the center of the maximal ball encompassed by $A_\tau(K_\tau)$ and the center of the minimal ball enclosing $A_\tau(K_\tau)$ are both located at the origin. Let $B_{r(t)}$ and $B_{R(t)}$ be solutions to the $p$-flow, respectively starting from $B_{r_-(A_\tau(K_\tau))}$ and $B_{\delta r_-(A_\tau(K_\tau))}$. The radii $R(t)$ and $r(t)$ are given by

$$R(t) = \left[(\delta r_-(A_\tau(K_\tau))^{1+\alpha} - (1+\alpha)(t-\tau)\right]^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}} \tag{4.7}$$

and

$$r(t) = \left[(r_-(A_\tau(K_\tau))^{1+\alpha} - (1+\alpha)(t-\tau)\right]^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}.$$

Notice that by the containment principle $B_{r(t)} \subseteq A_\tau(K_t) \subseteq B_{R(t)}$ for all $\tau \leq t \leq \tau + \frac{(r_-(A_\tau(K_\tau)))^{1+\alpha}}{1+\alpha}$, so we must have $T \geq \tau + \frac{(r_-(A_\tau(K_\tau)))^{1+\alpha}}{1+\alpha}$. Take $\tau^* := \tau + \frac{(r_-(A_\tau(K_\tau)))^{1+\alpha}}{2(1+\alpha)}$ and an arbitrary $z \in \mathbb{S}^n$. Set $\eta := \left(1 - \frac{np}{(p+1)(n+1)}\right)^{-1} > 0$. By

Lemma 4.3 and equation (4.7) we obtain that for the convex body $A_\tau(K_{\tau^*})$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta\left[\delta^{1+\alpha}-0.5\right]^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}} r_-(A_\tau(K_\tau))\left(\frac{\mathcal{K}}{s^{n+2}}\right)^{\frac{p}{p+n+1}}(z,\tau^*)&\\
&= \eta R(\tau^*)\left(\frac{\mathcal{K}}{s^{n+2}}\right)^{\frac{p}{p+n+1}}(z,\tau^*)\\
&\geq \eta\left(s\left(\frac{\mathcal{K}}{s^{n+2}}\right)^{\frac{p}{p+n+1}}\right)(z,\tau^*)\\
&\geq \frac{s_{A_\tau(K_\tau)}(z,\tau)-s_{A_\tau(K_{\tau^*})}(z,\tau^*)}{\tau^*-\tau}\\
&\geq \frac{2(r_-(A_\tau(K_\tau))-R(\tau^*))}{(r_-(A_\tau(K_\tau))^{1+\alpha}}\\
&= \frac{2\left(1-\left[\delta^{1+\alpha}-0.5\right]^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}\right)}{(r_-(A_\tau(K_\tau))^{\alpha}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for the convex body $A_\tau(K_{\tau^*})$ we have

$$\left(\frac{\mathcal{K}}{s^{n+2}}\right)^{\frac{p}{p+n+1}}(z,\tau^*)\geq\frac{2(1+\alpha)C}{(r_-(A_\tau(K_\tau))^{1+\alpha}},$$

for some positive constant $C$. Recall that

$$T\geq\tau+\frac{(r_-(A_\tau(K_\tau)))^{1+\alpha}}{1+\alpha}=\tau^*+\frac{(r_-(A_\tau(K_\tau)))^{1+\alpha}}{2(1+\alpha)}.$$

On the other hand, observe that $\left(\frac{\mathcal{K}}{s^{n+2}}\right)^{\frac{p}{p+n+1}}$ is invariant under special centro-affine transformations. Thus, we conclude that

$$\left(\frac{\mathcal{K}}{s^{n+2}}\right)^{\frac{p}{p+n+1}}(z,\tau^*)\geq\frac{2(1+\alpha)C}{(r_-(A_\tau(K_\tau))^{1+\alpha}}\geq\frac{C}{T-\tau^*},$$

for the convex body $K_{\tau^*}$. To complete the proof, it is sufficient to show that each $t\geq t_*:=\frac{(r_-(A_0(K_0)))^{1+\alpha}}{2(1+\alpha)}$ can be expressed as $t=\tau+\frac{(r_-(A_\tau(K_\tau)))^{1+\alpha}}{2(1+\alpha)}$ for a $\tau\geq 0$ :

Define the function $f$ on the time interval $[t_*,T)$ by

$$f(\tau)=\tau+\frac{(r_-(A_\tau(K_\tau)))^{1+\alpha}}{2(1+\alpha)}-t.$$

Recall from Theorem 2.5 that $\lim\limits_{t\to T}V(A_t(K_t))=\lim\limits_{t\to T}V(K_t)=0$. Hence, we must have $\lim\limits_{t\to T}r_-(A_t(K_t))=0$. This implies that $\lim\limits_{\tau\to T}f(\tau)=T-\tau>0$. On the other hand we have $f(0)\leq 0$. As $f$ is continuous, we conclude that there exists a $\tau$ such

that $f(\tau)=0$.
Our argument to verify the lemma is now complete. □

*Remark* 4.5. For each $t\in[0,T)$ by the containment principle we have:

$$\frac{r_-(A_t(K_t))^{1+\alpha}}{1+\alpha}\leq T-t\leq\frac{r_+(A_t(K_t))^{1+\alpha}}{1+\alpha}\leq\frac{(\delta r_-(A_t(K_t)))^{1+\alpha}}{1+\alpha}. \tag{4.8}$$

**Lemma 4.6** (Upper bound on the centro-affine curvature)**.** *Let $K_0$ be a convex body whose Mahler volume is $\varepsilon$-pinched and the assumption (3.1) is satisfied. Let $\{K_t\}_{[0,T)}$ be the smooth, strictly convex solution of the evolution equation (1.2). Then there exist a constant $C'>0$ such that on the time interval $T/2\leq t<T$ we have*

$$\left(\frac{\mathcal{K}}{s^{n+2}}\right)^{\frac{p}{p+n+1}}(z,t)\leq\frac{C'}{T-t}.$$

*Proof.* Fix $t^*\in[T/2,T)$. Therefore,

$$\tilde{K}_t^{t^*}=\frac{1}{(T-t^*)^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}}A_{2t^*-T}(K_{t^*+(T-t^*)t})$$

is a solution of (1.2) on the time interval $[-1,0]$. By inequalities (4.8), at time $t=-1$ we have

$$r_-(\tilde{K}_{-1}^{t^*})=\frac{r_-(A_{2t^*-T}(K_{2t^*-T}))}{(T-t^*)^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}}\geq\frac{(2(1+\alpha))^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}}{\delta}$$

and

$$r_+(\tilde{K}_{-1}^{t^*})=\frac{r_+(A_{2t^*-T}(K_{2t^*-T}))}{(T-t^*)^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}}\leq\delta(2(1+\alpha))^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}.$$

By our remark after the assumption (3.1) we know that $\delta<1.5^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}$. Thus, by the containment principle for each time $t\in[-1,0]$ we get:

$$r_-(\tilde{K}_t^{t^*})\geq\left((1+\alpha)\left(\frac{2}{\delta^{1+\alpha}}-1\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}\geq\left(\frac{1+\alpha}{3}\right)^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}},$$

and

$$r_+(\tilde{K}_t^{t^*})\leq\delta(2(1+\alpha))^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}<(3(1+\alpha))^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}.$$

This in turn implies , using Lemma 4.1, that the centro-affine curvature of the convex body $\frac{1}{(T-t^*)^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}}A_{2t^*-T}(K_{t^*})=\tilde{K}_0^{t^*}$ is bounded by a positive constant $C'$. Thus, the centro-affine curvature of $A_{2t^*-T}(K_{t^*})$ satisfies

$$\left(\frac{\mathcal{K}}{s^{n+2}}\right)^{\frac{p}{p+n+1}}\leq\frac{C'}{T-t^*}.$$

Since the centro-affine curvature is an affine invariant quantity, we infer that the centro-affine curvature of $K_{t^*}$ fulfils

$$\left(\frac{\mathcal{K}}{s^{n+2}}\right)^{\frac{p}{p+n+1}}(z,t^*) \leq \frac{C'}{T-t^*}.$$

As $t^* \in [T/2, T)$ is arbitrary and $C'$ is independent of $t^*$, the proof is complete. □

## 5. Proof of the main theorem

In this section, we will conclude the proof of the main theorem.

*Proof.* Fix $\max\{3T/4, \frac{T+t_*}{2}\} \leq t^* < T$. We know

$$\tilde{K}_t^{t^*} = \frac{1}{(T-t^*)^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}} A_{2t^*-T}(K_{t^*+(T-t^*)t})$$

is a solution of (1.2) on the time interval $[-1, 0]$ with

$$r_-(\tilde{K}_t^{t^*}) \geq \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{3}\right)^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}},$$

and

$$r_+(\tilde{K}_t^{t^*}) < (3(1+\alpha))^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}.$$

Since $2t^* - T \geq \max\{T/2, t_*\}$, by Lemmas 4.4 and 4.6 we get

$$\frac{C}{2(T-t^*)} \leq \left(\frac{\mathcal{K}}{s^{n+2}}\right)^{\frac{p}{p+n+1}}(z, 2t^*-T) \leq \frac{C'}{2(T-t^*)}.$$

Hence, as $\alpha + 1 = \frac{2(n+1)p}{p+n+1}$ we conclude that the centro-affine curvature of $\tilde{K}_{-1}^{t^*}$ also satisfies

$$\frac{C}{2} \leq \left(\frac{\mathcal{K}}{s^{n+2}}\right)^{\frac{p}{p+n+1}} \leq \frac{C'}{2}.$$

To prove the main theorem, we recall two basic observations contained in Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2:

(1) The minimum of the speed, $\min\limits_{\mathbb{S}^n}\left(s\left(\frac{\mathcal{K}}{s^{n+2}}\right)^{\frac{p}{p+n+1}}\right)$, is non-decreasing along the $p$-flow.
(2) The speed remains bounded from above along the $p$-flow as long as the inradius has a lower bound. Furthermore, the upper bound on the speed depends only on the speed and circumradius of the initial convex body, and the lower bound on the inradius of evolving convex bodies.

Using observations (1) and (2) we conclude that each convex body $\tilde{K}_t^{t^*}$ for $t \in [-1, 0]$ fulfils

$$C_1 \leq s \left(\frac{\mathcal{K}}{s^{n+2}}\right)^{\frac{p}{p+n+1}} (z, t) \leq C_2.$$

For constants $C_1$ and $C_2$ independent of $t^*$. Indeed, these constants are independent of $t^*$ as they only depend only on $C$, $C'$, and $\alpha$. Consequently, each convex body $\tilde{K}_t^{t^*}$ for $t \in [-1, 0]$ satisfies

$$C_3 \leq S_n(z, t) \leq C_4$$

for some constants $C_3$ and $C_4$ independent of $t^*$. Now Lemma 2.4 implies that there is a constant $C_5$ independent of $t^*$ such that each convex body $\tilde{K}_t^{t^*}$ for $t \in [-1/2, 0]$ fulfils $\kappa_i \geq C_5$. Since $S_n \geq C_3$ by Remark 2.3 we can find a constant $C_6$ independent of $t^*$ such that

$$C_5 \leq \kappa_i \leq C_6$$

for each convex body $\tilde{K}_t^{t^*}$ and $t \in [-1/2, 0]$. Therefore, by [17] we conclude that there are uniform bounds on higher derivatives of the curvature of the $\tilde{K}_t^{t^*}$ for $t \in [-1/2, 0]$. In particular,

$$\tilde{K}_0^{t^*} = \frac{1}{(T - t^*)^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}} A_{2t^* - T}(K_{t^*})$$

has uniform $\mathcal{C}^k$ bounds independent of $t^*$.

Consequently, there is a sequence of times $\{t_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that as $\{t_k\}_k$ approaches $T$, the family of convex bodies $\left\{\frac{1}{(T-t_k)^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}} A_{2t_k - T}(K_{t_k})\right\}_k$ converges in the $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ topology to a convex body $\tilde{K}_T$. We now proceed to to find what the limiting shape is. We will start with a few facts on convex bodies.

A celebrated affine invariant quantity associated to $K$ is its affine surface area. More recently it was realized that the affine surface area belongs to a whole family of equi-affine invariant notions of surface areas. The homogeneous such surface areas are called $p$-affine surface areas and were defined by Lutwak [19], for $p \geq 1$ in the context of the Firey-Brunn-Minkowski theory. The $p$-affine surface area of a smooth convex body $K$ can be expressed as

$$\Omega_p(K) = \int\limits_{\mathbb{S}^n} \frac{s}{\mathcal{K}} \left(\frac{\mathcal{K}}{s^{n+2}}\right)^{\frac{p}{n+1+p}} d\mu_{\mathbb{S}^n},$$

A central inequality at the core of the centro-affine geometry is the $p$-affine isoperimetric inequality due to Lutwak [19], $p \geq 1$, which is a generalization of the classical affine isoperimetric inequality:

$$\frac{\Omega_p^{n+p+1}(K)}{V^{n-p+1}(K)} \leq (n+1)^{n+p+1} \omega_{n+1}^{2p}.$$

The equality holds above if and only if K is a centered ellipsoid.

The following result is an immediate corollary of the inequality of Proposition 4.2 in [24].

**Theorem 5.1** (Monotonicity of $p$-affine isoperimetric ratio)**.** [24] *Let $\{K_t\}_{[0,T)}$ be a smooth, strictly convex solution of equation (1.2). Then the p-affine isoperimetric ratio, $\frac{\Omega_p^{n+1+p}(K_t)}{V^{n+1-p}(K_t)}$, is non-decreasing along the p-flow. The monotonicity is strict unless $K_t$ is an ellipsoid centered at the origin.*

Consequently, monotonicity of the $p$-affine isoperimetric ratio and Theorem 2.5 with a similar argument as in [13], implies that $\tilde{K}_T$ must be an ellipsoid. Therefore, we get

$$\lim_{t_k\to T}\frac{\Omega_p^{n+1+p}(\tilde{K}_0^{t_k})}{V^{n+1-p}(\tilde{K}_0^{t_k})}=(n+1)^{n+p+1}\omega_{n+1}^{2p},$$

and again by monotonicity of the $p$-affine isoperimetric ratio

$$\lim_{t\to T}\frac{\Omega_p^{n+1+p}(\tilde{K}_0^{t})}{V^{n+1-p}(\tilde{K}_0^{t})}=(n+1)^{n+1+p}\omega_{n+1}^{2p}.$$

By the equality case in the $p$-affine isoperimetric inequality [19], we infer that, modulo $GL(n+1)$,

$$\lim_{t\to T}\frac{1}{(T-t)^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}}A_{2t-T}(K_t)=B^{n+1}$$

sequentially in the $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ topology. On the other hand, observe that by the containment principle

$$\frac{r_-(A(K_t))^{1+\alpha}}{1+\alpha}\leq T-t\leq\frac{r_+(A(K_t))^{1+\alpha}}{1+\alpha}$$

for all $A\in SL(n+1)$. In particular,

$$\frac{r_-(A_{2t-T}(K_t))^{1+\alpha}}{1+\alpha}\leq T-t\leq\frac{r_+(A_{2t-T}(K_t))^{1+\alpha}}{1+\alpha}.$$

Therefore

$$r_-\left(\frac{1}{((1+\alpha)(T-t))^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}}A_{2t-T}(K_t)\right)\leq 1\leq r_+\left(\frac{1}{((1+\alpha)(T-t))^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}}A_{2t-T}(K_t)\right).$$

From these last inequalities, it follows that, modulo $SL(n+1)$,

$$\lim_{t\to T}\frac{1}{((1+\alpha)(T-t))^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}}A_{2t-T}(K_t)=B^{n+1}$$

sequentially in the $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ topology. The proof is complete. □

## References

[1] Alessandroni, R., Sinestrari, C.: Evolution of hypersurfaces by powers of the scalar curvature, Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. 9, 541–571 (2010)

[2] Andrews, B.: Contraction of convex hypersurfaces by their affine normal, J. Differential Geom. 43, 207–230 (1996)

[3] Andrews, B.: Gauss curvature flow: the fate of the rolling stones, Invent. Math. 138, no. 1, 151–161 (1999)

[4] Andrews, B.: Motion of hypersurfaces by Gauss curvature, Pacific J. Math. 195, no. 1 (2000)

[5] Andrews, B.: Pinching estimates and motion of hypersurfaces by curvature functions, J. Reine Angew. Math. 608, 17–33 (2007)

[6] Andrews, B., Chen, X.: Surfaces moving by powers of Gauss curvature, preprint 2011, available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1111.4616`.

[7] Andrews, B., McCoy, J.: Convex hypersurfaces with pinched principal curvatures and flow of convex hypersurfaces by high powers of curvature, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 364, no. 7, 3427–3447 (2012)

[8] Angenent, S., Sapiro, G., Tannenbaum, A.: On the heat equation for non-convex curves, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 11, no. 3, 601–634 (1998)

[9] Ball, B., Böröczky K.J.: Stability of some versions of the Prékopa-Leindler inequality, Monatsh. Math. 163, 1–14 (2011)

[10] Blaschke, W.: Über affine Geometrie I. Isoperimetrische Eigenschaften von Ellipse und Ellipsoid, Leipz. Ber. 68, 217–239 (1916)

[11] Cabezas-Rivas, E., Sinestrari, C.: Volume-preserving flow by powers of the mth mean curvature, Calc. Var. and Partial Differential Equations 38, 441–469 (2010)

[12] Chow. B.: Deforming convex hypersurfaces by the nth root of the Gaussian curvature, J. Differential Geom. 22, no. 1, 117–138 (1985)

[13] Ivaki, M.N.: Centro-affine curvature flows on centrally symmetric convex curves, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., to appear, available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1205.6456`

[14] Ivaki, M.N.: On the stability of the p-affine isoperimetric inequality, J. Geom. Anal. doi: 10.1007/s12220-013-9401-1, (2013)

[15] Ivaki, M.N.: Centro-affine normal flows on curves: Harnack's estimate and Ancient solutions, available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1211.2346`

[16] Ivaki, M.N., Stancu A.: Volume preserving centro affine normal flows, Comm. Anal. Geom., to appear, available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1211.7105`

[17] Krylov, N.V.: Nonlinear Elliptic and Parabolic Equations of the Second Order, D. Reidel Publishing Co., Dordrecht, (1987)

[18] Loftin, J., Tsui, M.P.: Ancient solutions of the affine normal flow, J. Differential Geom. 78, 113–162 (2008)

[19] Lutwak, E.: The Brunn-Minkowski-Fiery theory II: Affine and geominimal surface areas, Adv. Math. 118, 244–294 (1996)

[20] Sapiro, G., Tannenbaum, A.: On affine plane curve evolution, J. Funct. Anal. 119, 79–120 (1994)

[21] Schnürer, O.C.: Surfaces contracting with speed $|A|^2$, J. Differential Geom. 71, no. 3, 347–363 (2005)

[22] Schulze, F.: Convexity estimates for flows by powers of the mean curvature, Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. 5, no. 2, 261–277 (2006)

[23] Smoczyk, K.: Starshaped hypersurfaces and the mean curvature flow, Manuscripta Math. 95, no. 2, 225–236 (1998)

[24] Stancu, A.: Centro-affine invariants for smooth convex bodies, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN, doi: 10.1093/imrn/rnr110 (2011)

[25] Tso, K.: Deforming a hypersurface by its Gauss-Kronecker curvature, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 38, 867–882 (1985)

[26] Wu, C., Tian, D., Li, G.: Forced flows by powers of the $m$-th Mean curvature, Armen. J. Math. 3, 61–91 (2010)

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Concordia University, Montreal, QC, Canada, H3G 1M8

*E-mail address*: `mivaki@mathstat.concordia.ca`